
The “officially released” date that appears near the beginning of each opinion is the date the opinion will be published in the Connecticut Law Journal or the date it was released as a slip opinion. The operative date for the beginning of all time periods for filing postopinion motions and petitions for certification is the “officially released” date appearing in the opinion. In no event will any such motions be accepted before the “officially released” date.

All opinions are subject to modification and technical correction prior to official publication in the Connecticut Reports and Connecticut Appellate Reports. In the event of discrepancies between the electronic version of an opinion and the print version appearing in the Connecticut Law Journal and subsequently in the Connecticut Reports or Connecticut Appellate Reports, the latest print version is to be considered authoritative.

The syllabus and procedural history accompanying the opinion as it appears on the Commission on Official Legal Publications Electronic Bulletin Board Service and in the Connecticut Law Journal and bound volumes of official reports are copyrighted by the Secretary of the State, State of Connecticut, and may not be reproduced and distributed without the express written permission of the Commission on Official Legal Publications, Judicial Branch, State of Connecticut.

FORT TRUMBULL CONSERVANCY, LLC v. PLANNING AND ZONING
COMMISSION—CONCURRENCE

ZARELLA, J., with whom SULLIVAN, C. J., joins, concurring. I agree with the majority's conclusions in this case but write separately only to reaffirm my continuing belief in the plain meaning rule as expressed in my dissenting opinion in *State v. Courchesne*, 262 Conn. 537, 597, 618–19, 816 A.2d 562 (2003) (*Zarella, J.*, dissenting). The plain language of the coastal site plan review statutes, in my view, aptly demonstrates that the review undertaken in connection with these statutes is “part and parcel” of the report issued pursuant to General Statutes § 8-24. The majority's resort to legislative history in part I of its opinion, therefore, unnecessarily complicates the analysis contained therein.